

REMARKS

Claims 1-41 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 21, 31 and 32 are independent.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephone interview on February 26, 2007. During the interview, differences between the claims and the Varma et al. reference were discussed.

The remarks below may serve as a further summary of the interview.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 based on Varma and Parthesarathy. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Summary of the Application and the Varma Reference

As an aid to the Examiner, Applicants present the following summary of the application and the Varma reference. This summary is not intended as a substitute for the Examiner's reading the application and the reference in their entireties. This summary is also not intended to characterize the claims or any terms used in the claims, which are discussed below.

Briefly, the present application describes a peer-to-peer collaboration system. Such a system operates by creating local copies of a shared space in computers used by each member in a collaboration session. "Activity" software in each user computer interacts with other users to receive input about changes to the shared space. [0002] The "activity" software can contain multiple components that perform multiple components that allow the activity to perform the desired functions [0004].

A problem arises in a peer-to-peer collaboration system operating in this fashion because, in order to maintain consistent copies of the shared space for each of the users, each user

computer must be configured with components that execute the update requests in the same way. Maintaining the user computers to have consistent sets of components may be difficult. [0005] Further, the peer-to-peer model makes it difficult to automate the upgrade process. In the peer-to-peer model, there is no central location with which all users must interact so there is no central location from which component upgrades can be released. [0008]

The application is directed to collaboration in a peer-to-peer system allowing asynchronous management of software downloads – which can be used to improve the upgrade process in an activity program of a user. Though the Varma reference describes a collaboration system, it does not describe a peer-to-peer collaboration system. Rather, Varma describes a modification of a collaboration system in which the collaboration server is distributed over multiple devices, with each partition of the workspace containing a partition server that distributes commands to user computers within the partition.

Claim 1

Applicants respectfully disagree that Varma, either alone or in combination with Parthesarathy, teaches or suggests all limitations of Claim 1. The Examiner acknowledges that Varma does not teach or suggest “a download manager” or “an install manager” as claimed, but cites Parthesarathy for teaching these elements. Applicants respectfully assert that there is no motivation to combine the references and even if combined, the references do not teach or suggest all limitations of any of the claims.

As to a motivation to combine, Varma describes a collaboration system in which commands are distributed to multiple user computers. However, Varma does not recognize the desirability of downloading software component resources in response to user action within a collaboration session. Though Parthesarathy describes a software download system, the reference relates to software vendors providing updates. The reference does not teach or suggest obtaining software components in response to action by a user within a collaboration session.

Accordingly, neither reference provides a teaching or suggestion to motivate the combination of the peer-to-peer system described in Varma with the software update notification system of Parthesarathy.

Further, even if the references were combined, Applicants respectfully assert that the result would be a collaboration system in which each user computer obtained software updates from a software vendor through a notification system as in Parthesarathy. The result would not be a system meeting all limitations of any of the claims.

For example, the references, even if combined would not teach or suggest “an activity program adapted to implement a portion of a collaboration session, the activity program generating a component update request in response to an action by a user within the collaboration session,” as claimed. Nor would they teach “a parser that extracts from the component update request URL information.” Accordingly, the references would not teach or suggest “a component manager that receives the request from the activity program and has a parser that extracts from the request URL information which identifies the location of a file containing software component resources for satisfying the request,” as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner asserts that Varma teaches this element, at column 11, lines 38-54. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited passage of Varma describes construction of a distributed server to replace a centralized collaboration server by identifying machines within each partition to host “a partition server” that performs the same functions as a centralized collaboration server for the user computers within that partition. The passage does not describe processing of update requests within individual user computers. The passage also does not describe extracting from the request information that identifies the location of a component to satisfy the request.

Parthesarathy also does not teach or suggest these elements of claim 1. Though Parthesarathy describes downloading and installing software updates based on information obtained over a “software update channel” (col. 5, line 61- col. 6, line 6), the reference does not describe a peer-to-peer collaboration system. Accordingly, it does not describe generating or

processing an update request in response to an action by a user within a collaboration session. It also provides no teaching or suggestion of parsing such a request once generated. Accordingly, Parthesarathy does not teach or suggest “a component manager that receives the request from the activity program and has a parser that extracts from the request URL information which identifies the location of a file containing software component resources for satisfying the request,” as claimed. Because neither reference discloses these elements of the claim, the references, even if combined, would not teach or suggest all limitations of the claim.

Further, claim 1 has been amended to recite “the component manager is adapted to determine whether the requested software component is already installed on the computer system and to selectively invoke the download manager based on the determination.” Because Varma does not describe downloading components, it does not teach or suggest this limitation. Parthesarathy also does not teach or suggest this limitation.

Accordingly, for multiple reasons, the references do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 11

Claim 11 recites a method of operating a peer-to-peer collaboration system. That method includes an “component update request identifying the component [being used in a collaboration session]” and “parsing the request to extract from the request URL information which identifies the location of a file containing software component resources for satisfying the request and an identification of the component.”

In addition, claim 11 has been amended to indicate that the a file is selectively downloaded in response to an availability of the component. In the present application the component update request related to a component being used in a collaboration session. A component may or may not be available already to satisfy the request. Accordingly, selective download is relevant in the context of a system as described in the present application, but is not taught or suggested in the references.

As described above, neither Varma nor Parthesarathy describes a request identifying a component used in a collaboration section. Accordingly, neither reference teaches or suggests parsing the request to extract information identifying a component resource for satisfying the request. Accordingly, the references, even if combined, do not teach or suggest all limitations of the claim. Further, also as noted above, there is no motivation to combine the references in a way that meets the limitations of the claim.

For multiple reasons, Varma and Parthesarathy do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 11 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 21

Claim 21 recites a computer program product for use in a peer-to-peer collaboration system that is adapted to receive an update request generated as a result of user interaction with the peer-to-peer collaboration system. This product includes “program code that extracts from the request information which identifies the location of a first file for satisfying the request.” As discussed above, neither Varma nor Parthesarathy teaches or suggests identifying the location of a file for satisfying a request in a peer-to-peer collaboration system. Accordingly, even if the references were combined, they would not teach or suggest all limitations of claim 21. Further, there is no motivation to combine the references in a way that meets all limitations of the claim.

For multiple reasons, the references do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 21 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 31

Claim 31 recites a computer system adapted to receive an update request generated as a result of user interaction with a peer-to-peer collaboration system. That system includes “program code that extracts from the request URL information which identifies the location of a first file containing software component resources for satisfying the request.” As described above, neither Varma nor Parthesarathy teaches or suggests identifying the location of a file containing component resources for satisfying a request generated as result of user interaction

with a peer-to-peer collaboration system. Accordingly, even if combined, the references would not teach or suggest all limitations of claim 31. Further, there is no motivation to combine the references in a way that meets all limitations of the claim.

For multiple reasons, the references do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 31 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 32

Claim 32 recites apparatus for use in a peer-to-peer collaboration system that includes “means for implementing a collaboration session ... adapted to receive an indication of a component in use within the collaboration session and to selectively generate an update request for the component.” Neither Varma nor Parthesarathy teaches or suggests generating an update request for a component based on use within a collaboration session as recited in the claims. Accordingly, the references, even if combined, do not teach or suggest all limitations of the claim. Further, as described above, there is no motivation to combine the references in a way that meets all limitations of the claim.

For multiple reasons, the references do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 32 and the rejection should be withdrawn.


Dependent Claims

The remaining claims depend from one of independent claims 1, 11, 21, 31 or 32. Accordingly, each of the dependent claims should be allowed for the reasons given in connection with the independent claims. Accordingly, the rejection of all of the claims should be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: March 2, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Edmund J. Walsh

Registration No.: 32,950

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

Federal Reserve Plaza

600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206

(617) 646-8000